

Department of Student Affairs Administration in Higher Education Bylaws

Table of Contents

I. DEPARTMENT OF STUDENT AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION	4
II. ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION	4
A. PREAMBLE	4
1. <i>History</i>	4
2. <i>Mission</i>	6
B. MEETING GUIDELINES.....	6
C. DEFINITIONS OF MEMBERSHIP & VOTING PROCEDURES	7
1. <i>Membership</i>	7
2. <i>Voting During a Meeting</i>	7
3. <i>Voting by Email</i>	7
D. DEFINITIONS OF QUORUM & MAJORITY.....	8
E. CHANGING BYLAWS.....	8
III. FACULTY AND STAFF RESPONSIBILITIES	8
A. FACULTY RESPONSIBILITIES & EXPECTATIONS	8
1. <i>Teaching</i>	9
2. <i>Scholarship</i>	9
3. <i>Service</i>	9
4. <i>Outside Activities</i>	9
B. INSTRUCTIONAL ACADEMIC STAFF (.5 FTE OR GREATER) RESPONSIBILITIES & EXPECTATIONS.....	9
1. <i>Teaching</i>	9
2. <i>Scholarship</i>	10
3. <i>Service</i>	10
4. <i>Outside Activities</i>	10
C. PART-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL ACADEMIC STAFF RESPONSIBILITIES & EXPECTATIONS.....	10
D. NON-INSTRUCTIONAL ACADEMIC STAFF RESPONSIBILITIES & EXPECTATIONS.....	10
E. UNIVERSITY STAFF RESPONSIBILITIES & EXPECTATIONS	10
F. OTHER FACULTY RESPONSIBILITIES	11
G. STUDENT LEARNING ENVIRONMENT SURVEYS	11
IV. MERIT EVALUATION (ANNUAL REVIEW)	11
A. EVALUATION PROCESSES & CRITERIA	12
1. <i>Ranked Faculty and IAS in Permanent Budgeted Instructional Lines</i>	13
2. <i>Department Chair (if applicable)</i>	14
B. DISTRIBUTION OF MERIT FUNDS	14
C. APPEAL PROCEDURES (IF APPLICABLE).....	14
V. FACULTY PERSONNEL REVIEW	15
A. RETENTION (PROCEDURE, CRITERIA, AND APPEAL).....	15
B. TENURE REVIEW AND DEPARTMENTAL TENURE CRITERIA	16
1. <i>Retention Process</i>	16
2. <i>Tenure</i>	18
3. <i>Reconsideration</i>	18
C. POST-TENURE REVIEW	18
1. <i>Relationship to Annual Review and Other Personnel Review</i>	19
2. <i>Departmental Post-Tenure Review Committee</i>	19

3.	<i>Post-Tenure Review Notification</i>	19
4.	<i>Materials</i>	19
5.	<i>Post-Tenure Review Categorization</i>	20
6.	<i>Procedure when Faculty Member “Meets Expectations”</i>	20
7.	<i>Procedure when Faculty Member “Does Not Meet Expectations”</i>	21
8.	<i>Departmental Post-Tenure Review Criteria</i>	21
D.	FACULTY PROMOTION PROCEDURES (PROCEDURE, CRITERIA, AND APPEAL)	22
	<i>Review Process</i>	22
1.	<i>Criteria</i>	24
2.	<i>Reconsideration</i>	25
VI. INSTRUCTIONAL ACADEMIC STAFF REVIEW		25
A.	ANNUAL REVIEW	25
B.	IAS PROMOTION PROCEDURES.....	25
C.	APPEAL PROCEDURES RE: ANNUAL REVIEW	26
VII. NON-INSTRUCTIONAL ACADEMIC STAFF REVIEW		26
A.	ANNUAL REVIEW.....	26
VIII. GOVERNANCE		26
A.	DEPARTMENT CHAIR.....	26
1.	<i>Election of the Department Chair</i>	26
2.	<i>Responsibilities and Rights of the Department Chair</i>	26
B.	GRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORSHIPS.....	27
1.	<i>General Graduate Program Director (GPD) Responsibilities</i>	27
2.	<i>M.S.Ed. Graduate Program Director (GPD) Responsibilities</i>	28
3.	<i>Ed.D. Graduate Program Director (GPD) Responsibilities</i>	28
C.	STANDING DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEES.....	29
1.	<i>Appeals Committee</i>	29
2.	<i>Assessment Committee</i>	29
3.	<i>Merit Evaluation Committee</i>	29
4.	<i>SAA Graduation Committee</i>	30
5.	<i>Equity Liaison</i>	30
D.	DEPARTMENTAL PROGRAMMATIC ASSESSMENT PLAN & PHILOSOPHY OF ASSESSMENT	30
E.	PROGRAM GOALS	30
1.	<i>M.S.Ed. Program Goals</i>	30
2.	<i>Ed.D. Program Goals</i>	31
F.	ADDITIONAL DEPARTMENTAL POLICIES	31
1.	<i>Sick Leave</i>	31
2.	<i>Vacation</i>	31
3.	<i>Salary Equity Policy</i>	31
4.	<i>Graduate Faculty Status</i>	32
5.	<i>Course Assignment</i>	32
6.	<i>Summer Teaching</i>	32
7.	<i>Peer Review of Teaching</i>	32
IX. SEARCH AND SCREEN PROCEDURES		32
A.	TENURE-TRACK FACULTY	33
B.	INSTRUCTIONAL ACADEMIC STAFF	33
C.	NON-INSTRUCTIONAL ACADEMIC STAFF	33
D.	POOL SEARCH	33
X. STUDENT RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS		33

A.	GRADE APPEALS	34
1.	<i>Preliminary Procedures</i>	34
2.	<i>Formal Procedures</i>	34
3.	<i>Further Action</i>	36
4.	<i>Conditions</i>	36
B.	ACADEMIC NON-GRADE APPEALS	36
C.	PROGRAM POLICY APPEALS	36
D.	EXPECTATIONS, RESPONSIBILITIES, AND ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT	36
E.	INCOMPLETE GRADES	37
F.	PROGRAM DISMISSAL	37
G.	ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT	37
H.	NON-ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT	37
I.	ADVISING POLICY	38
XI.	OTHER	38
A.	FACULTY SABBATICALS	38
	APPENDIX A: STATEMENT OF TEACHING IN THE DEPARTMENT OF STUDENT AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATION	40
	APPENDIX B: STATEMENT OF SCHOLARSHIP IN THE DEPARTMENT OF STUDENT AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATION	43
	APPENDIX C: STATEMENT OF SERVICE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF STUDENT AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATION	46
	APPENDIX D: POLICY ON OUTSIDE ACTIVITIES	47
	APPENDIX E: MERIT ASSESSMENT RUBRIC.....	49
	APPENDIX F: FACULTY PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING FORM	51
	APPENDIX G: AD HOC (IAS) EVALUATION FORM	54
	APPENDIX H: DEPARTMENT ACADEMIC DISMISSAL POLICY - APPEAL PROCESS	56

I. DEPARTMENT OF STUDENT AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

The Department of Student Affairs Administration in Higher Education (SAA) is an instructional unit within the College of Arts, Social Sciences, and Humanities (CASSH) at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse (UWL). The Bylaws in this document were adopted by the members of the Department of Student Affairs Administration in Higher Education in accordance with the University of Wisconsin System (UWS) and UWL Faculty and Academic Staff Personnel Rules.

These bylaws were last updated and adopted during regularly scheduled department meetings in 2024. Specific approval dates are included for each section, if applicable.

Note: URLs in these bylaws are provided for convenience. Please notify the SAA department (saa@uwlax.edu) if any link is inaccurate or does not work.

II. ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION

Department members are governed by six interdependent sets of regulations:

1. Federal and State laws and regulations;
2. UW System policies and rules;
3. UWL policies and rules;
4. College policies and rules;
5. Shared governance bylaws and policies for faculty and academic staff; and
6. Departmental bylaws.

A. PREAMBLE

1. History

The Department of Student Affairs Administration in Higher Education (SAA) at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse (UWL) has a rich history of growth and adaptation. Since its beginning in 1967, the SAA program has expanded from a counseling-focused student personnel program to a leading department offering both master's and doctorate-level degrees. Now, it's unique as the college's only fully online and blended, self-supported academic unit.

Currently, the department consists of five ranked faculty members, one non-instructional academic staff acting as a Graduate Writing Consultant and Program Manager, one part-time Academic Department Associate, and additional part-time ad hoc instructors who are leaders in the field and have active in professional roles outside of the one or two classes they may teach in our program. The combination of ranked faculty and ad hoc instructors is an effective staffing model that students consistently note as a strength of the program.

The following timelines highlights major steps and achievements of the SAA department through the years, showcasing its commitment to providing high-quality education in student affairs and higher education administration:

1967:

- The SAA master's-level graduate program is established at UWL, titled College Student Development and Administration, focusing on counseling-based student personnel programs, taught by practitioners within the university.

2007:

- The SAA program receives Higher Learning Commission (HLC) approval to offer the SAA degree online, becoming the first online graduate program at UWL without partner institution collaboration. The master's program adheres to the Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) for student affairs preparation programs.
- Program name changes from College Student Personnel to Student Affairs Administration in Higher Education (SAA)

2010:

- Introduction of the first ranked faculty line, marking the beginning of a shift towards a more traditional academic staffing model.

2012:

- The department receives UWL Faculty Senate approval for departmental status.
- Addition of a full-time lecturer line.

2013:

- A second ranked faculty line is added, continuing the expansion of the department staff.
- SAA partners with UW-River Falls (UWRF) to host Graduate Student Internship (GSI) positions, leading to a partner hybrid program.
- Program offered a hybrid M.S.Ed. option to accommodate students with UWRF GSI positions

2015:

- SAA engages in partnerships with UW-Eau Claire (UWEC) and UW-Stout for GSI positions, allowing students from these partnerships to enroll in SAA's online program until 2022, when a blended option became available.
- The department receives UWS and HLC approval to offer a Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) degree in Student Affairs Administration & Leadership (SAAL), a 54-credit program including a dissertation.

2016:

- Third and fourth faculty lines are added, enhancing the department's teaching and research capabilities.

2017:

- The online Ed.D. program launches and SAAL enrolls its first Ed.D. cohort.

2021:

- The department becomes fully self-sustaining.
- The final on-campus master’s cohort is taught out.
- The full-time lecturer line is converted to a Non-Instructional Academic Staff line with the title of Graduate Writing Consultant and Program Manager.

2022:

- Master’s students are offered the choice of fully asynchronous or blended delivery options, with the blended program including hybrid course offerings with synchronous meetings accessible at UWL or remotely (in place of the on-campus option previously offered).

2023:

- All core faculty have retired.
- Fifth faculty line is added.

SAA typically enrolls about 45 master’s students (including both first- and second-year students) and about 55 doctoral students (including first-, second-, and third-year students, as well as those who have completed all coursework and are finishing their dissertation).

2. Mission

The mission of the department is to advance the field of student affairs by preparing scholar-practitioners for leadership in the multifaceted context of higher education. The mission, program learning outcomes, and curriculum for the Master of Science in Education (M.S.Ed.) and Doctorate in Education (Ed.D.) programs are listed in the graduate catalog.

B. MEETING GUIDELINES

Department meetings will be run according to the most recent edition of Robert’s Rules of Order (<http://www.robertsrules.com/>) and WI state open meeting laws (<https://www.doj.state.wi.us/sites/default/files/office-open-government/Resources/OML-GUIDE.pdf>; summary at <https://www.wisconsin.edu/general-counsel/legal-topics/open-meetings-law/>). Since SAA is a fully online and blended department, meetings will be held in fully virtual or hybrid spaces to permit faculty and staff with telecommuting agreements to participate.

Minutes will be recorded by the departmental ADA or a voting member and will be distributed in a timely fashion to department members. Copies of the minutes of department meetings and committee meetings will be kept in a secure virtual location. Minutes from closed meetings will be available by request.

C. DEFINITIONS OF MEMBERSHIP & VOTING PROCEDURES

Under ordinary circumstances, the Department will endeavor to operate by consensus, observing the following principles: cooperation based on shared goals for the good of the Department and its academic programs; timely distribution of information; thorough consultation with all concerned parties; respect for minority positions on all matters, but especially on matters of conscience; and a commitment to timely action. The Department will share the service work of the department equitably and will mentor newer members in understanding department, college, and university processes.

1. Membership

In general, the department functions as a committee-of-the-whole, headed by an elected or appointed Department Chair. Members of the department are defined as instructional academic staff members with at least a 50% annual appointment, non-instructional academic staff members with 100% appointments, and all ranked¹ (tenure-track or tenured) faculty for the purpose of conducting business at any regular meeting.

2. Voting During a Meeting

Unless specifically indicated otherwise, a simple majority of those voting carries the vote. Voting occurs with a voice vote or a hand vote and any member can call for a roll call vote. Proxy voting is not allowed. Members who join by teleconference or other virtual meeting options and have heard all the deliberation are eligible to vote.

Robert's Rules indicate that abstentions do not affect the voting outcome (they are non-votes). Paper balloting will be allowed upon request by any voting member of the department, and if requested, paper ballots must be signed and kept securely for 7 years. All members of the department (as defined above) have equal voting privileges on departmental matters except for ranked faculty personnel decisions.

Note: Voting in closed session (e.g., personnel review) cannot be anonymous or secret. And, any individual can request the vote and who voted which way (e.g., public record). Documentation is needed regarding the vote; however, "who voted how" need not be reflected in minutes if there is other documentation that exists and can be accessed.

3. Voting by Email

Voting by email will be allowable if the action item is not related to ranked

¹ Note: "Tenure-track" refers to those faculty still in their probationary period who have not yet received tenure; "Ranked" refers to both tenured and tenure-track faculty.

faculty personnel decisions and a department meeting is not feasible within the time needed for a decision (e.g., outside of a regular academic session).

A motion can come from any voting department member. A second is needed. A call for the final vote cannot occur until 2 business days from the last discussion email and 2 business days will be allowed for voting. A quorum of voting members must reply for the vote to carry. Results from an email vote will be reported in the minutes of the next official department meeting.

D. DEFINITIONS OF QUORUM & MAJORITY

A quorum for the purpose of conducting business at any department meeting shall be a simple majority of the persons eligible to vote. For personnel meetings a quorum is achieved with 2/3 of those eligible to vote.

E. CHANGING BYLAWS

These bylaws may be amended through the following procedures:

- A two-thirds majority of the current department membership who are eligible to vote on bylaws is required to amend the bylaws.
- Any proposed amendment(s) shall be presented and distributed in writing at a department meeting (first reading) and voted on at the next subsequent meeting (second reading); policies pertaining to personnel issues, which are the responsibility of the ranked faculty (tenure-track or tenured), or of the tenured faculty may only be changed by those voting.
- Second readings can be waived for bylaws that do not pertain to personnel decisions; in this case, the vote would occur during the first reading.

III. FACULTY AND STAFF RESPONSIBILITIES

A. FACULTY RESPONSIBILITIES & EXPECTATIONS

Faculty responsibilities are referenced in Section IV of the Faculty Senate bylaws entitled "Responsibilities of Departments, Department Members and Department Chairpersons" (<https://www.uwlax.edu/faculty-senate/articles-bylaws-and-policies/>).

All faculty in the department are expected to maintain high levels of professional competency in areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Since the SAA is a self-sustaining department, the SAA faculty workload is typically 60% teaching, 20-30% service, and 10-20% scholarship.

1. Teaching

All faculty members of the department are required to keep current in their subject and profession. Additional information may be found in individual position descriptions. Faculty members are required to work with the Department Chair to facilitate student evaluation of learning in each course they teach (see Section III F). As graduate faculty, SAA ranked faculty typically have a 3:3 load, or 18 graduate credits, for the academic year. See Appendix A for the department's definition of teaching.

2. Scholarship

Ranked faculty members of the department are required to develop and maintain an active program of scholarship, which includes supporting master's capstone projects and/or chairing dissertations. See Appendix B for department definition of scholarship.

3. Service

All faculty members of the department are required to serve their department by leading or participating in routine committee work, regularly attending program and department meetings, advising students as assigned, and attending special events such as the SAA Graduation Celebration. See Appendix C for the department's definition of service.

4. Outside Activities

Faculty may engage in outside activities such as research, consulting, or other activities that are not part of their required university responsibilities. These activities shall not interfere with university responsibilities and must conform to policies governing outside activities as explained in Appendix D.

B. INSTRUCTIONAL ACADEMIC STAFF (.5 FTE OR GREATER) RESPONSIBILITIES & EXPECTATIONS

Requests for IAS hiring will be presented to the college dean. The request will indicate the position title and will outline specific duties including teaching and any additional workload. Total workload for IAS is defined as a standard minimum teaching load plus additional workload equivalency activities. See Faculty Senate Articles, Bylaws and Policies (<https://www.uwlax.edu/faculty-senate/articles-bylaws-and-policies/>).

The expectations below are for IAS with .5 FTE or greater appointments for a full academic year.

1. Teaching

IAS members of the department are required to keep current in their subject and profession. IAS are required to work with the Department Chair to review students' learning environment surveys each course they teach (see Section III G).

2. Scholarship

IAS members of the department are not required to develop and maintain an active program of scholarship. They are, however, encouraged to pursue their own line of research and publication or to collaborate with other SAA faculty and/or students on scholarship.

3. Service

IAS members of the department are required to serve their department by leading or participating in routine committee work, regularly attending program and department meetings, advising students as assigned, and attending special events including the SAA Graduation Celebration.

4. Outside Activities

IAS members of the department may engage in outside activities such as research, consulting, or other activities that are not part of their required university responsibilities. These activities shall not interfere with university responsibilities and must conform to policies governing outside activities as explained in Appendix D.

C. PART-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL ACADEMIC STAFF RESPONSIBILITIES & EXPECTATIONS

The Department typically employs part-time instructional academic staff (referred to as ad hoc instructors throughout these bylaws) to teach a course or two annually. Ad hoc instructors are non-voting members of the department who are not expected to participate in the regular business of the department, though they are welcome to serve on department committees as non-voting members, to serve on dissertation committees as voting members (if requested by doctoral students and approved by dissertation chairs), and to participate in peer evaluations of instruction or other recruiting or professional development activities with or on behalf of the department. In other words, they are expected to follow department guidelines for effective teaching, to remain current with their scholarship and/or professional practice, and to serve the department as time and interest allow.

D. NON-INSTRUCTIONAL ACADEMIC STAFF RESPONSIBILITIES & EXPECTATIONS

Responsibilities and expectations for non-instructional academic staff are based on their individual position description or contracts.

E. UNIVERSITY STAFF RESPONSIBILITIES & EXPECTATIONS

Responsibilities and expectations for university staff, such as the Academic Department Associate (ADA) are based on their individual position description or contracts.

F. OTHER FACULTY RESPONSIBILITIES

The ranked faculty may be appointed or elected to specific administrative appointments such as Department Chair, Graduate Program Director of the M.S.Ed. or Ed.D. programs, or other ad hoc appointments. These faculty roles are outlined further in Section VIII of these bylaws.

Additionally, the Department often invites scholars and professionals (from outside of UWL) with terminal degrees to volunteer to serve on dissertation committees. These individuals are vetted through the Ed.D. Graduate Program Director and Department Chair, then the Dean's Office, followed by Graduate & Extended Learning and, if necessary, the Graduate Council in order to receive approval to serve as Graduate Faculty on committees at UWL. Their expectations are outlined within SAAL's dissertation webpage (<https://www.uwlax.edu/academics/grad/student-affairs-administration-and-leadership/dissertation/#tab-70929>).

G. STUDENT LEARNING ENVIRONMENT SURVEYS

The department will follow the UWL LENS policy and procedure available on the Faculty Senate webpage (<https://www.uwlax.edu/faculty-senate/lens/>). Results from the Faculty Senate approved LENS questions are required for retention, tenure, post-tenure review, and promotion for ranked faculty and for renewal and promotion of Instructional Academic Staff in the form of the LENS summary report. The LENS summary report contains student response frequencies for target responses to LENS items for courses taught within the last six semesters. Tenure-track faculty will be expected to provide LENS summary reports since date of hire for retention and tenure decisions. LENS summary reports will be electronically accessible to personnel review committees who have been granted the authority to access them.

Note: UWL's approach for gathering student feedback on instruction changed in the fall of 2023. As such, during the transition years, contract, non-contract, and promotion meetings will include two types of student evaluation systems: Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) for terms prior to Fall 2023 and LENS from Fall 2023 forward.

SAA recognizes that rankings of faculty have limited value in a small department and student bias often exists in evaluations of instructors. Therefore, the Department is less interested in raw scores or comparisons than in how instructors use feedback from students and peers to improve their teaching.

IV. MERIT EVALUATION (ANNUAL REVIEW)

The results of merit reviews for all ranked faculty who have completed at least one academic year at UWL are due to the Dean's Office on December 15 annually. Merit

reviews reflect activities during the prior academic year ending May 31. All faculty and IAS with .5 FTE or greater annual appointments have a June 1st deadline for entering teaching, scholarship, and service activities into the electronic portfolios system (Digital Measures) on activities from the prior year (June 1st–May 31st).

The purpose of merit evaluation is to recognize, celebrate, and award outstanding faculty productivity in the department, allowing colleagues to understand and appreciate the work of one another.

A. EVALUATION PROCESSES & CRITERIA

The Department Chair will designate a ranked faculty member as the chair of the Merit Review Committee. Preferably, this person is a tenured faculty member and will serve a term of three years. Alternatively, the Department Chair will designate the convener by the first Friday of the fall semester in a given academic year.

The merit review process begins no later than September 15 when the convener schedules a meeting with all faculty engaged in merit review. This meeting shall occur no later than November 1 each fall. In the e-mail invitation for the review meeting, the convener will share the annual activity report from the previous academic year and will ask each faculty member to submit the merit assessment rubric (Appendix E).

Additional information, including peer evaluation of instruction forms (Appendix F), a summary of activities completed while on sabbatical, etc. should also be submitted when applicable. The Department Chair may seek colleague feedback about their own activities and submit this information with their merit materials.

Each faculty member will complete the merit review rubric for themselves by October 15. In anticipation of the merit review meeting, each faculty member should review the activity report of each other colleague to be assessed. Though completion of the rubric for colleagues is not required, faculty may find the rubric useful to reference in preparing points of strength and questions for their colleagues.

In the actual review meeting, the convener will lead a discussion on how faculty assessed themselves using the merit review rubric. Presentations by each faculty member are not necessary, but feedback and comments are encouraged. At the end of the discussion on each faculty member's merit, all faculty will together determine the merit designation (not meritorious, meritorious, or highly meritorious)² for each colleague based on the rubric (self-assessment) and on the discussion in the merit review meeting (peer assessment). Voting may be necessary should the self and peer assessment of merit differ

² Prior to revisions in 2024, the SAA bylaws included a fourth merit designation, "exceptionally meritorious," which may appear within previous personnel records.

from one another per faculty member.

The convener will keep notes and merit designations and provide these to the Department Chair who will create the notices/letters to each faculty member. These merit designation notices must be sent to each faculty member by November 15. This must occur so a faculty member may appeal their merit designation to the Department Chair in writing within 7 calendar days of the receipt of the merit notice. The Department Chair will send merit designations to the Dean by December 15.

1. Ranked Faculty and IAS in Permanent Budgeted Instructional Lines

Consistent with UWS 3.05 and UWL 3.05, the performance of all ranked faculty and IAS in the department will be reviewed annually. Areas to be evaluated for IAS include teaching, scholarship, and service to the department, college, university, profession and/or community as defined by the department (see Appendices A, B, and C). Specific dates for completion of annual evaluations of faculty and IAS are specified by UWL administration. These dates are listed on the UWL academic department calendar

[\(https://www.uwlax.edu/info/academic-department-calendar/\)](https://www.uwlax.edu/info/academic-department-calendar/)

- a. *Purpose*: The purpose of annually reviewing faculty and IAS is to provide constructive feedback to guide professional development needed to support the program, department, college, and institution. The results of this review process will be used for multiple purposes including promotion, retention, tenure, post-tenure review, construction of the departmental annual report for the college, and updating professional development plans.
- b. *Teaching*: The definition of teaching can be found in Appendix A. Teaching includes traditional classroom instruction and advising of graduate students, their program of study, and their research. Teaching is ranked as the area of greatest importance in terms of faculty and IAS responsibility.

Teaching effectiveness will be assessed using student Learning Environment Survey (LENS) submissions obtained from each of the courses in which the individual is instructor of record. Other evidence of successful teaching or teaching improvement may be submitted for consideration including, but not limited to, peer evaluation of teaching, teaching awards, published educational materials, and development of unique teaching resources.

- c. *Scholarship*: The definition of scholarship can be found in Appendix B. To be considered meritorious, the department requires ranked faculty to have a record of ongoing scholarly activity.

- d. *Service*: The definition of service can be found in Appendix C. Service contributions shall be judged by the impact on and contribution to the program, department, college, university, community, and/or profession. Service can include serving on committees as well as committees in the community and professional involvement in national, regional, or state organizations.

2. Department Chair (if applicable)

The Department Chair is part of the merit review process like any other faculty member of the department.

Each faculty and IAS member’s merit designation will be classified as “not meritorious,” “meritorious,” or “highly meritorious.” To gain a designation of “highly meritorious,” faculty must show outstanding performance in at least two of the three areas evaluated (i.e., teaching, scholarship, and service). To gain a designation of meritorious, faculty must show satisfactory performance in at least two areas. Should a faculty member not perform satisfactorily in more than one area, they will be designated as not meritorious.

Merit Category	Characteristics
Not meritorious	Unsatisfactory performance in 2 of 3 areas
Meritorious	Satisfactory performance in at least two areas
Highly Meritorious	Outstanding performance in at least two areas

B. DISTRIBUTION OF MERIT FUNDS

If available, merit funds distributions or base salary adjustments will follow UW System and UW-La Crosse policies approved by Faculty Senate.

C. APPEAL PROCEDURES (IF APPLICABLE)

A faculty or IAS member may request a reconsideration of their merit designation. This request must be made in writing to the Department Chair within 7 calendar days of the Department Chair’s distribution of merit designations. The Merit Review Committee will reconvene within 1 week following the request for reconsideration, and the committee's final evaluation decision will be communicated in writing to the faculty or IAS member. The Department Chair may similarly appeal their merit designation within 7 calendar days of the initial notice.

Appeals beyond the departmental level may be presented to the Complaints, Grievances, Appeals, and Academic Freedom Committee (see Section I. E. of the Faculty Senate Bylaws).

V. FACULTY PERSONNEL REVIEW

The department will follow the policies regarding retention and tenure described in the Faculty Personnel Rules (UWS 3.06 - 3.11 and UWL 3.06 -3.08)

<https://kb.uwlax.edu/104775>

NOTE: UWS 1.0 indicates that “days” refers to calendar days rather than working or business days—with references to how to treat holidays.

Tenure/retention decisions will be guided by the criteria established in the bylaws at the time of hire unless a candidate elects to be considered under newer guidelines. Criteria outlined in Section V. A & V. B. in these bylaws should be applied to faculty with a contract date after:

03/31/2024

The department will follow policies guiding part-time appointments for faculty and tenure clock stoppage available on the Human Resources website.

A. RETENTION (PROCEDURE, CRITERIA, AND APPEAL)

1. Faculty under review provide an electronic portfolio related to their teaching, scholarship, and service activities extracted from their date of hire to the date of departmental review. Hyperlinked syllabi are required and the candidate may choose to provide additional evidence. Additional materials may be required for departmental review and will be indicated in these bylaws.
2. The department will provide the following materials to the dean:
 - a. Department letter of recommendation with vote
 - b. Teaching assignment information (TAI) data sheet that summarizes the courses taught, workload data, and grade distribution
 - c. Merit evaluation data

- d. Teaching evaluation data (e.g., SEI/LENS summary reports³) by individual course and semester
3. The initial review of tenure-track faculty shall be conducted by the tenured faculty of the appropriate department in the manner outlined below. The Retention/Tenure Review Committee will consist of all tenured members of the department. If the department does not have at least three tenured individuals, a committee of at least three will be recommended, comprised of tenured faculty from a closely aligned discipline. Review committees are also encouraged to include one tenured faculty from outside the Department, selected by the Department Chair in consultation with the tenure-track faculty member.
4. All first-year tenure-track faculty will be reviewed in the spring of their first year. A departmental letter will be filed with the Dean and HR. Formal reviews resulting in contract decisions will minimally occur for tenure-track faculty in their 2nd, 4th, and 6th years. In the non-contract review years (1st, 3rd, 5th) tenure-track faculty will be reviewed by the same Retention/Tenure Review Committee mentioned above. The Department Chair will send the review letters to the faculty member under review, the Dean, and HR by the due dates listed in UWL's Academic Department Calendar (<https://www.uwlax.edu/info/academic-department-calendar/>).

B. TENURE REVIEW AND DEPARTMENTAL TENURE CRITERIA

1. Retention Process

- a. *Notice:* Subsequent to the call of the Provost, the Department Chair shall establish a review date and inform all tenure-track faculty with at least 20 calendar days' notice to prepare a set of materials describing performance in the following areas: (a) teaching, (b) scholarly and research activity, and (c) service—including service to the department, the college, the university, and the community and profession.
- b. *Meeting:* The date, time, and place of the meeting shall be conducted in compliance with the Wisconsin Open Meeting Rule. For a retention and tenure meeting to take place, attendance by 2/3 of the Retention/Tenure Review Committee constitutes a quorum. The Department Chair presides over the meeting and keeps detailed minutes of the action and

³ “NOTE: SEI data will be provided for candidate TAI forms through Spring 2023. TAI information from Fall 2024 and beyond will not include student survey on instruction as part of the form. LENS information will be provided in a separate format from TAIs.” <https://kb.uwlax.edu/104534>

vote. These minutes must be retained in a secure location for 7 years. The tenure-track faculty shall have the opportunity to make a written and/or oral presentation at the meeting to provide highlights regarding teaching, scholarship, and service.

- c. *Materials:* Candidates under review for retention should provide two reports from the electronic portfolio system:
 - i. A personnel report drawn from the date of hire at UWL as a ranked faculty member (with appropriate evidence hyperlinks) with a 3–7 page narrative statement provided addressing the candidate’s teaching philosophy, teaching development, and appropriate context for scholarly and service work.
 - ii. An annual activity report from the most recent year (June 1 – May 31), the candidate can exclude summer if they wish.
 - iii. The Department Chair will provide merit, SEI and/or LENS, and TAI summary information for the review period.
- d. *Action:* After the faculty member under review gives a brief five-minute oral presentation highlighting their accomplishments in teaching, research, and service and responds to any questions from the committee, the Department Chair will excuse the faculty member under review from the meeting. Prior to the beginning of the review of the candidate, the meeting will go into closed session according to Section 19.85 in the Wisconsin Statutes. However, candidates under tenure consideration can also request an open meeting. During the review meeting, the Chair shall entertain a motion regarding the retention of the candidate(s). The Chair will lead the review meeting through the criteria of teaching, scholarship, and service for each faculty member being considered for retention or tenure. Passage of a motion to retain a candidate(s) (and, if appropriate, to recommend tenure) shall require a 2/3 majority of those present and voting. A written record of votes (e.g., faculty name, signature, and vote) is required and is public record and subject to data retention rules.
- e. *Communication of Vote:* The faculty member under review will be informed verbally and in writing of the decision of the Review Committee within 7 days of the vote taking place. The Department recommendation and decision (actual vote) shall be reported in writing with supporting documentation to the Dean. Retention requires a 2/3 majority vote by tenured faculty.

2. Tenure

The granting of academic tenure represents a long-term commitment of institutional resources which requires proof of excellence in past performance and a forecast that an individual faculty member's intellectual vitality and future contributions will continue to be of high quality for many years to come. Tenure-track instructors should not expect an award of tenure solely on the fact that their contracts have been consistently renewed; however, the procedures for making tenure decisions and recommendations for tenure-track faculty parallel procedures for retention and are based on the body of work evidenced during the individual's time in rank. The process for tenure follows the retention process outlined above. Tenure will be granted with a 2/3 majority vote by the Retention/Tenure Review Committee.

The decision to recommend a faculty member for tenure in the SAA Department is based on an appraisal of the candidate's overall contribution from their date of hire at UWL in a tenure-track position. Achieving tenure in SAA reflects the following: consistent evidence of a strong commitment to student learning and quality teaching, program of scholarly inquiry, and service to the department, university, and/or the faculty member's profession (see Appendices A, B, and C for statements of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service, respectively.)

Specifics regarding departmental expectations demonstrating evidence of strong teaching, scholarship, and service are indicated in the details of the merit and retention segments of these bylaws. Tenure-track faculty should pay close attention to retention letters as guides for working toward positive promotion and tenure recommendations from the department.

3. Reconsideration

Any candidate wishing to appeal their own department retention or tenure decision is required to submit a written petition to the Department Chair carefully detailing the basis on which this appeal is being made. This appeal must be filed with the Department Chair within two weeks of the notification of the contested retention/tenure decision. The Retention/Tenure Review Committee will then hold a special closed-session hearing to review all evidence pertinent to this petition in the presence of the appellant. Subsequent to this hearing of the facts the Retention/Tenure Review Committee will dismiss the appellant from the hearing room and will render its final decision on the appeal.

C. POST-TENURE REVIEW

The department follows the UWL procedure and schedule regarding post-tenure review

1. Relationship to Annual Review and Other Personnel Review

The post-tenure review may coincide or overlap with other forms of department-level personnel review. However, a separate letter regarding post-tenure review using the structure indicated below must be provided to the Dean (Provost/HR), and the procedure for post-tenure review as described below must be followed.

2. Departmental Post-Tenure Review Committee

The departmental Post-Tenure Review Committee shall be comprised of all tenured faculty members in the department, with a minimum of 3 tenured faculty members. This committee may not be the same as the Retention/Tenure Review Committee described in prior sections, as the department may have more or different tenured faculty since tenure was granted.

The Department Chair serves as a committee member and chair of the committee unless the department chair holds tenure in another department or is being reviewed. In either of these two cases, the committee shall elect a chair to complete the administrative components of the process. In the event that there are not three tenured department members, the Department Chair, in consultation with the Dean and the faculty member under review, shall meet to select outside members. If there is not a mutual agreement, the Dean shall have the final say in the selection of the outside members.

3. Post-Tenure Review Notification

The Post-Tenure Review Committee will meet to review the faculty member's materials and determine whether the faculty member (a) meets expectations or (b) does not meet expectations. The faculty member must receive at least 21 calendar days' notification of the time/date of the meeting and the deadline (7 days prior to the meeting) for which the materials will be due. Electronic notification through official UWL email is appropriate. The faculty member is not required to be present for deliberations and the committee will move into closed session following WI open meeting laws.

4. Materials

Material for Consideration by the Departmental Post-Tenure Review Committee: 7 calendar days prior to the committee meeting, the faculty member under consideration for post-tenure review needs to provide to the committee via its chair, at minimum an electronic report from the electronic faculty activity portfolio system (e.g., annual activity report with hyperlinks) drawn from the last date of tenure (use January 1 of the tenure year if first post-tenure review) or last post-tenure review to the date of the committee

review, and the faculty member must ensure that the report is up-to-date on 5 years of activities and includes the following materials:

- hyperlinks to at least one syllabus for each course (not each section of each course, or each term of each course) taught in the past 5 years,
- hyperlink to at least one peer review of teaching from the past 5 years,
- hyperlinks to evidence of scholarly activities associated with the specific entry (e.g., publication, grant, presentation)
- no hyperlinks for service are required

The department chair will provide TAI and SEI scores/LENS reports covering the dates since the last review.

5. Post-Tenure Review Categorization

After moving to close the meeting following the proper state statute WI Statute 19.85(1)(c) for personnel review, the departmental Post-Tenure Review Committee will consider a motion regarding the faculty member under post-tenure review “meeting expectations” or “not meeting expectations.” A 2/3 majority vote is needed for the motion to pass. The motion and the numerical results of the vote should be indicated in the minutes and the letter to the Dean. Depending on the result of the department vote, the faculty member will be considered to be in one of the following two categories:

- a. *Meets expectations*: This category is awarded to those tenured faculty members whose performance reflects the expected level of accomplishment based on departmental bylaws and is likely to be met by faculty who maintain satisfactory merit reviews annually.
- b. *Does not meet expectations*: This category is assigned to those tenured faculty members whose performance reflects a level of accomplishment below the expected departmental level and which requires correction. All reviews resulting in “does not meet expectations,” unless overturned upon further review, will result in a remediation plan as described below.

6. Procedure when Faculty Member “Meets Expectations”

The departmental Post-Tenure Review Committee chair provides a letter to the Dean and the faculty member within 14 calendar days of the personnel meeting (no later than December 15) with the following information:

- The date and the numerical result of the vote indicating the overall categorization of “meets expectations” for the faculty member. The

letter should include the names of all of the tenured faculty who voted and the committee chair's signature.

- A brief description of the consensus points of the committee regarding the faculty member's strengths in teaching, scholarship, and/or service that formed the basis for the committee's "meets expectations" decision. The faculty member can request a meeting with the committee chair to discuss the evaluation further, if the faculty member wishes.

The Dean forwards the letter to HR and the Provost (Chancellor's designee) no later than February 1.

7. Procedure when Faculty Member "Does Not Meet Expectations"

Details regarding a "Does Not Meet Expectations" finding by the Post-Tenure Review Committee are provided in the UWL procedure and schedule regarding post-tenure review approved by the UW System Board of Regents in November 2016, available at the following link: <https://kb.uwlax.edu/104244>

8. Departmental Post-Tenure Review Criteria

- a. *Teaching:* For the category of "Meets Expectations", the department expects each faculty member to teach courses in their areas of expertise; the expected teaching load is the equivalent of 9 semester hours for graduate faculty without other duties involving reassignment from teaching. Faculty shall:
 - develop a syllabus for each course that meets UWL and department requirements
 - develop acceptable and fair methods of evaluation for each course
 - meet with students as scheduled for classes or make provisions for acceptable alternative activities
 - keep up with current curriculum requirements and participate in advising students;

Performance in Teaching may be deemed "does not meet expectations" if there is a pattern of any of the above (or similar) activities not occurring at a satisfactory level, something which should have been raised in merit reviews as concerns arise, so performance issues can be addressed prior to the post-tenure review.

- b. *Scholarship:* For the category of "Meets Expectations", the Department expects each tenured faculty member to engage in scholarly activities that may include any scholarly activity indicated in the Statement of Scholarship in the Department of Student Affairs Administration (Appendix B).

Performance in Scholarship may be deemed “does not meet expectations” if there is a pattern of the above (or similar) activities not occurring at a satisfactory level.

- c. *Service*: For the category of “Meets Expectations”, the Department expects each tenured faculty member to volunteer for and serve on committees that contribute to the success of the Department, College, University, community, and/or profession in fulfilling their missions. The Department expects faculty to:
- regularly attend and participate as an active member in department and committee meetings, including chairing committees, volunteering for administrative roles, and equitably sharing the assessment, recruitment, and other administrative duties
 - attend at least one UWL graduation ceremony per year unless extenuating circumstances prevent attendance
 - engage in any service activity indicated in Appendix C: Statement on Service Activity.

Performance in Service may be deemed “does not meet expectations” if there is a pattern of any of the above (or similar) activities not occurring at a satisfactory level.

D. FACULTY PROMOTION PROCEDURES (PROCEDURE, CRITERIA, AND APPEAL)

The department will follow the guidelines, resources, and schedules regarding faculty promotion available at <https://www.uwlax.edu/academic-affairs/provost-promotion-resources/>

Review Process

The Promotion Committee for faculty pursuing promotion to Associate Professor will consist of all ranked faculty. First-year faculty may participate in the process but should abstain from voting. The Promotion Committee for faculty pursuing promotion to Full Professor will consist of faculty at the rank of Associate Professor or Full Professor. In cases where a committee consists of fewer than three tenured faculty members at the rank required, members of the original Retention/Tenure Review Committee of the candidate under review may serve and/or the Department Chair may designate new members to serve on the committee. The committee will vote by roll call unless a signed ballot is requested by any committee member. The Department Chair presides over the promotion consideration review. Should the Department Chair be up for promotion, they will work with the Dean to designate an appropriate chair of the Promotion Committee.

Human Resources is the official source of promotion eligibility information for faculty and is responsible for annually informing individual faculty (and department chairs and deans) of where to access up-to-date information regarding eligibility status. These lists will be reviewed for accuracy by the Department Chair. The Department Chair will notify the faculty members who are eligible in writing of their eligibility and upon request will provide copies of the university and departmental regulations on promotion and information on the provisions of the Wisconsin Open Meetings Law. Optionally, the department chair may choose to also provide a letter of recommendation to be included in the department materials section of the Faculty Promotion Report (see Section 5.2.2 of the Guide to Faculty Promotion <https://kb.uwlax.edu/104534>)

The Department Chair will notify in writing faculty eligible for promotion of the date of the promotion meeting with at least 20 calendar days' notice. Faculty who are eligible and wish to be considered for promotion must submit their portion of the Faculty Promotion Report (see Section 5.1 of the Guide to Faculty Promotion <https://kb.uwlax.edu/104534>) and a CV to the Department Chair at least 7 days prior to the date of the promotion consideration meeting. The Department Chair will forward these materials and student evaluation information to the members of the Promotion Committee prior to the promotion meeting date. Faculty may submit other written materials and/or make an oral presentation at the consideration meeting. The requirements of the Wisconsin Open Meeting law shall apply to this meeting.

The Joint Promotion Committee requires that a faculty member who has had reassigned time to fulfill a position outside the expectations of a standard faculty member (e.g., director of a center or program) must provide two related documents in their promotion report⁴:

- a. One or more letters from their supervisor(s) (e.g., department chair, Dean, etc.) that outlines their job description with respect to each reassigned time appointment.
- b. Documentation that illustrates their level of success in the role fulfilled by the appointment, such as performance reviews or other data that

⁴ This does not include the department chair. The description of the department chair's duties (item a, above) does not need to be supplied because it is contained within the Faculty Senate Policies. However, the department promotion committee letter should reflect indicators of performance evaluation (item b, above).

show how the aims of the appointment are being met. The candidate is responsible for uploading these documents in their promotion report.

Before the promotion meeting, a tenured faculty member will be chosen by the department chair to write the Promotion Committee's assessment of the candidate (i.e., promotion letter). This person will have the required 7 days to complete the forms. In the event of more than one candidate, one personnel member will be chosen for each candidate.

During the promotion review meeting, the ranked faculty will review and discuss the faculty member's promotion file and any presentation made at the promotion meeting. The department chair will lead the promotion meeting through the criteria of teaching, scholarship, and service for each faculty member considered for promotion. Only materials relevant to the criteria established for promotion by the department, college, and the university will be considered.

The committee will vote by roll call unless a signed ballot is requested by any committee member.

Within 7 calendar days of the promotion meeting, the Department Chair shall notify each candidate of the committee's recommendation. For positive recommendations, the Department Chair shall include a letter of recommendation on behalf of the committee as part of the Faculty Promotion Report. With these materials, the Department Chair shall also transmit a written recommendation to the Dean. A copy of these letters shall be provided to the candidate at least 7 days prior to the submission of the promotion file to the Dean.

1. Criteria

To be considered for promotion to a higher rank, faculty must meet the minimum university criteria (see [Provost website for Faculty Promotion](#) and [HR website for Faculty Promotion Resources](#)) as well as the minimum departmental criteria.

- a. *Associate Professor*: For the rank of Associate Professor, a candidate must provide evidence of teaching excellence, establishment of a program of scholarship, and a record of service. Evidence of teaching excellence shall include the results of self, peer, and student evaluation of teaching (see Appendix A). Scholarship shall be consistent with the department's definition of scholarly activity (see Appendix B). Service shall also be consistent with the department's definition of service (see Appendix C).

- b. *Professor*: For the rank of Professor, a faculty member must show evidence of continued excellence in teaching, significant scholarly productivity, and substantial service activity. Continued teaching excellence is measured by the results of self, peer, and student evaluations. Significant scholarly productivity is judged by the quality and quantity of presentations, publications, and grant activity. Substantial and sustained service activity will include applied service, service to the department, college/university, professional service, or contributions to the profession.

2. Reconsideration.

After receiving the Chair's notification, the promotion candidate will have 14 days to request reconsideration by the Promotion Committee. Each promotion candidate will have the right to appeal the Department's reconsideration decision to the Complaints, Grievances, Appeals, and Academic Freedom Committee (CGAAF). Written notice of the reconsideration decision will be transmitted to the candidate and the Dean within 7 days of the reconsideration meeting.

VI. INSTRUCTIONAL ACADEMIC STAFF REVIEW

A. ANNUAL REVIEW

In accordance with Unclassified Personnel Rules Chapter 10, academic staff (instructional and non-instructional) will be evaluated annually.

<https://kb.uwlax.edu/104782>

The Department Chair serves as the supervisor for IAS and will preside over the annual IAS review process. The Department Chair may choose to involve ranked department members in the IAS review process, specifically if they have observed or evaluated a course of the IAS. Evaluation will be based on review of syllabi and LENSs, and any additional evidence a candidate wishes to provide in the categories related to career progression. All IAS are required to have an annual review based on their contract and/or position description, whether they are full-time or in ad hoc appointments.

Due to the difference in timing between Human Resources System's due dates and our course timelines (i.e., grade submissions, LENS reports, etc.), we utilize a DocuSign form for evaluating ad hoc IAS. This form is routed directly to HR. Refer to Appendix G for the DocuSign form used in this process.

B. IAS PROMOTION PROCEDURES

Policies and procedures guiding promotion for IAS are available at

<https://kb.uwlax.edu/104083>

NOTE: Only budgeted Redbooked IAS can be considered for promotion.

C. APPEAL PROCEDURES RE: ANNUAL REVIEW

Each career progression candidate will have the right to appeal the department's reconsideration decision to the Complaints, Grievances, Appeals and Academic Freedom Committee (CGAAF). Written notice of the reconsideration decision will be transmitted to the candidate and the Dean within 7 days.

VII. NON-INSTRUCTIONAL ACADEMIC STAFF REVIEW

A. ANNUAL REVIEW

In accordance with Unclassified Personnel Rules Chapter 10, academic staff (instructional and non-instructional) will be evaluated annually (<https://kb.uwlax.edu/104782>). Performance reviews for NIAS are maintained and managed in the e-Performance tool of the Human Resource System (HRS). Manager evaluation and employee acknowledgement are due June 30. Due dates for optional evaluation steps (such as defining goal criteria, check points, and finalizing goal criteria) can be found on the HR website (<https://www.uwlax.edu/human-resources/services/employee-relations/performance-management>).

VIII. GOVERNANCE

A. DEPARTMENT CHAIR

1. Election of the Department Chair

The Chair is elected by the Department in February for a three-year term. All department members (as determined by Department bylaws) are eligible to vote. The Dean shall send out nominating ballots to all eligible to vote. Any candidate who consents to serve and receives 60% of the ballots cast will be elected chair. If this does not occur, there will be a runoff between the two persons with the most nominations who have consented to run. In the event of a resignation or other reassignment/leave of a chair during a three-year term, a new chair will be elected by the department to (a) finish the term of the predecessor, or (b) begin a new three-year term pending consensus between the CASSH Dean's Office and department members.

2. Responsibilities and Rights of the Department Chair

The department will adhere to the selection and duties of the Chair as outlined by:

- a. Faculty Senate Policies under the headings "IV. Responsibilities of Departments, Department Members and Department Chairpersons," "V. The Selection of Department Chairpersons," and "VI. Remuneration of Department Chairpersons" (<https://www.uwlax.edu/faculty-senate/articles-bylaws-and-policies/>),
- b. Summer responsibilities of Department Chairs are outlined on the provost's site (<https://www.uwlax.edu/academic-affairs/academic-department-handbook/#tm-28909>), and
- c. CASSH Department Chair expectations on the dean's site (<https://www.uwlax.edu/cassh/resources-for-facultystaff/chair--ada-resources/#tm-14567>).

Bearing in mind the proportion of online and blended students, the Department Chair and other administrative appointments for faculty will maintain a campus and virtual presence required to be effective in the job.

B. GRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORSHIPS

Ranked faculty and full-time IAS in SAA are eligible to assume the role of graduate program director (GPD). Faculty serve in this role for a three-year appointment and can renew their role in consultation with the other faculty and the Department Chair. If at all possible, the Department Chair shall not also serve in the role of program director.

A graduate program director role includes a 2-course reassignment for each academic year and a summer stipend with an expectation of a .25 FTE work assignment for the entire summer (not just when summer classes are in session).

1. General Graduate Program Director (GPD) Responsibilities

Graduate Program Directors (GPD) provide leadership for the recruitment, admissions, enrollment, orientation, and retention of students in their respective programs.

- a. *Recruitment:* The GPD establishes plans to recruit students, especially those from traditionally underrepresented or marginalized populations. The GPD directs all marketing and recruitment efforts, including attending graduate school fairs and professional conferences. They collaborate with the NIAS and ADA staff on all print, web, and social media publications.
- b. *Admissions:* The GPD collaborates with the ADA to manage the application process, ensuring that application materials are complete, reviewing completed application files, and coordinating the virtual interview processes for applicants to the program.

- c. *Advising & Retention:* The GPD directs all face-to-face and/or online orientation efforts for all newly enrolled students at the beginning of their first summer or fall semester in the program and manages communications via handbooks and/or Canvas sites throughout the time students are enrolled in the program. The GPD organizes registration workshops each fall and spring and provides information to faculty advisors to best support students. Additionally, the GPD tracks enrollment, reaching out to students who haven't yet enrolled, and maintains student records (e.g., notes about any transfer credits and "off-sequence" degree completion plans).
- d. *Program Administration:* The GPD, working with the Department Chair, updates the curriculum and Graduate Catalog and supports ad hoc faculty teaching in the program. The GPD attends Graduate Program Director meetings and annual Graduate Summit organized by GEL, as well as biweekly administration meetings run by NIAS.
- e. *Assessment:* Finally, the GPD is responsible for providing information (such as trends in enrollment, including demographics, completion rates, loan rates to drive recruitment efforts for applicants) to the assessment committee for annual assessment reports, and semi-regular Graduate Academic Program Review reports and/or University Program Assessment Council reports.

2. M.S.Ed. Graduate Program Director (GPD) Responsibilities

In addition to the items listed in Section 1, the M.S.Ed. GPD oversees specific functions of the M.S.Ed. program, including:

- a. *Graduate Assistantship/Internships Coordination:* The GPD leads all efforts to recruit M.S.Ed. assistantship providers on- and off-campus and to place students into these positions. The GPD collaborates with graduate assistantship or internship providers to establish an interview process for open positions. The GPD coordinates communications with graduate assistantship and internship supervisors, ideally coordinating an annual meeting to discuss performance, address concerns, share feedback, and strengthen the partnership between the program and supervisors..

3. Ed.D. Graduate Program Director (GPD) Responsibilities

In addition to the items listed in Section 1, the Ed.D. GPD oversees specific functions of the Ed.D. program, including:

- a. *Dissertation Processes:* The Ed.D. GPD oversees the documentation of dissertation processes (e.g., verifying graduate faculty status for each committee member) and works with the ADA to track all paperwork (formation, proposal, final), and post links to defense recordings and dissertations in Canvas. Additionally, the GPD coordinates the dissertation

chair matching process each summer and is expected to attend the summer writers' retreat.

C. STANDING DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEES

Departmental committees play crucial roles in maintaining academic standards and supporting student success. Committee chair appointments are made with consideration of workload equity among department members, following the *Equity-Minded Faculty Workloads Report* by American Council on Education (ACE; 2021; <https://www.acenet.edu/Documents/Equity-Minded-Faculty-Workloads.pdf> . Additional appointments for ad hoc or standing committees (such as curriculum, recruitment, professional development, alumni, and other new initiatives) will be made with the same consideration. Current standing departmental committees include:

1. Appeals Committee

The Appeals Committee hears student grade appeals and program dismissal appeals. The committee shall include three members (committee chair, 1 ranked faculty, and 1 ad hoc faculty). The Department Chair will function as a neutral observer during any appeal hearing. The Department Chair will appoint the chair of the committee; other members of the committee will be selected based on the circumstances of the appeal. Committee chair serves for 1 year and can be reappointed.

2. Assessment Committee

The Committee shall consist of three department members (can include a combination of ranked faculty, ad hoc faculty, staff) who shall have responsibility for developing, conducting, and reporting the results of appropriate assessments of all department programs. The chair of the committee is appointed by the Department Chair. This committee is responsible for preparing annual assessment reports, academic program review self-studies, and any other assessment reporting required by the college or university—all in consultation with the full department faculty. The chair of this committee is ideally a more senior member of the department and/or a ranked faculty member who is not carrying other administrative appointments. Members serve for 1 year and can be reappointed.

3. Merit Evaluation Committee

The Merit Evaluation Committee shall include all ranked faculty and full-time IAS members of the department. The chair for the committee will be appointed each year by the Department Chair. Each committee member will review the teaching, scholarship, and service activities of all members in the department, excluding the review of their own activities. Members serve for 1 year and can be reappointed.

4. SAA Graduation Committee

The Graduation Committee organizes and implements SAA-sponsored graduation events, including the SAA graduation ceremony and the M.S.Ed. capstone poster session which are both held in May. The committee is chaired by the NIAS in consultation with the ADA and other stakeholders as needed (e.g., GPDs, SAA 790 instructor, and students).

5. Equity Liaison

Equity liaisons were established by to help further the University's mission of inclusive excellence. The equity liaison helps build awareness of the Department's role in UWL's mission to provide an equitable and inclusive educational and workplace environment for all by: advocating for best practices using unit-specific research and resources, contributing to development of the unit's IE/Equity plan, helping prompt discussion in the unit on equity conditions and needs, conveying information about equity gaps specific to the unit, cultivating a climate of shared responsibility for equity and diversity. The person appointed to this role is also responsible for authoring the department's Equity Liaison report each year.

<https://www.uwlax.edu/diversity-inclusion/equity-liaison-initiative/#tm-52323>)

D. DEPARTMENTAL PROGRAMMATIC ASSESSMENT PLAN & PHILOSOPHY OF ASSESSMENT

Assessment activities provide valuable information that guides program innovation and change. The Department will conduct regular assessments to identify areas for improvement in instruction, course design, and curriculum structure. As mentioned in Section VIII C., assessments will be planned and reported by the Assessment Committee in accordance with guidelines and due dates established by the University, College, and Department.

The Department uses several direct and indirect measures to assess program goals and graduate student learning outcomes. Assessment data for the M.S.Ed. program may include e-Portfolios, capstone projects, graduate assistant/internship evaluations, practicum evaluations, LENS reports, etc. Assessment data for the Ed.D. program may include dissertations, dissertation committee member feedback, LENS reports, etc.

E. PROGRAM GOALS

1. M.S.Ed. Program Goals

- a. Critically reflective scholarly practice: Integrate theoretical frameworks, systems-thinking models, current scholarship in the field, and professional experiences to become critically-reflective scholar practitioners

- b. Social justice and inclusion: Situate current higher education issues in broader contexts of systemic inequities and advocate for socially just and inclusive student affairs practices
- c. Humility: Approach work with general and cultural humility
- d. Communication skills: Demonstrate effective written and oral communication skills
- e. ACPA/NASPA Professional Competencies: Illustrate achievement of at least a beginner level of the ACPA/NASPA Professional Competencies

2. Ed.D. Program Goals

- a. Knowledge: To develop competent and expert SA professionals
- b. Management and Leadership: To develop innovative SA managers and leaders
- c. Assessment, Evaluation and Research: To develop scholar practitioners who advance research-informed decision making
- d. Equity, Diversity and Inclusion: To develop ambassadors of diversity, social justice, and globalization
- e. Interpersonal Relationships: To develop ethical and people-focused leaders

F. ADDITIONAL DEPARTMENTAL POLICIES

1. Sick Leave

Department members will account for sick leave in adherence to the most current UW System guidelines: <https://www.wisconsin.edu/ohrwd/benefits/leave/sick/>.

2. Vacation

If eligible, department members may utilize vacation hours as outlined by UW System guidelines: <https://www.wisconsin.edu/ohrwd/benefits/leave/vacation/>. (Note: academic-basis employees are *not* eligible for vacation.)

3. Salary Equity Policy

The Salary Equity Policy of SAA is intended to be consistent with and implement the salary equity policy of the University, which states that: Consideration of individual equity requests will depend upon the availability of funding.

Equity requests will be based upon instances of inversion (substantially dissimilar salaries for individuals with substantially similar qualifications and records), compression (reduction in the spread of salaries within and between ranks over time, often the result of hiring salaries increasing faster than pay plan increases) and retention (individuals who are offered higher salaries for comparable positions at other institutions).

Requests for equity adjustments may be initiated by individuals or as a result of

departmental review. If the Department does not support an individual request the individual may appeal directly to their Dean.

Departments will be provided with salary data for their units, which allows them to make comparisons and judgments about equity adjustments.

4. Graduate Faculty Status

Anyone teaching a course for the SAA Department must first obtain graduate faculty status as granted by UWL Graduate Council and/or the Director of Graduate Studies. The Department Chair will initiate this process.

5. Course Assignment

Course assignments are made by the Department Chair in consultation with graduate program directors, ranked faculty, and ad hoc faculty.

6. Summer Teaching

Summer teaching for faculty in SAA is not guaranteed. The Department Chair will approach departmental faculty members about summer teaching. Faculty do not have to teach over the summer if they choose not to.

7. Peer Review of Teaching

Ad hoc faculty and IAS will be reviewed once annually. Ranked faculty will have their teaching evaluated during each of the first 5 years of their employment in the department as discussed in the retention section of the bylaws.

Peer reviewers will be selected by the Department Chair in consultation with the faculty or IAS being reviewed. A peer reviewer may also serve as a mentor assigned to the ranked faculty or IAS being reviewed. Ad hoc faculty will be reviewed and evaluated by the Department Chair after each course taught.

In addition to classroom visitation or online class review, syllabi and evaluation instruments will be reviewed. The peer reviewer will complete an evaluation form (Appendix F) and write a letter summarizing the review. Both documents will be submitted to the reviewee and Department Chair. This review will be considered evidence of teaching effectiveness and progress.

At any time, ranked faculty, IAS, or ad hoc faculty may elect, or be required by the Department Chair, to have their teaching reviewed by peers. For example, peer review of teaching is one component of the promotion process and may be used as evidence to support post-tenure review.

IX. SEARCH AND SCREEN PROCEDURES

The department will follow recruitment and hiring procedures prescribed by the

University's Office of Human Resources (HR) in conjunction with AAO, UW System and WI state regulations. The UWL Search and Screen Policy and Procedures (<https://kb.uwlax.edu/104752>) are to be followed for all faculty and staff recruitments at UWL. Additionally, UWL's spousal/partner hiring policy can be found at <https://kb.uwlax.edu/103693>.

A. TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

Approved UWL tenure track faculty recruitment and hiring policy and procedures are listed within UWL's HR Policies (<https://kb.uwlax.edu/104752>).

A tenure-track faculty member search and screen committee must be chaired by a ranked faculty member. The Department Chair appoints the committee. The committee typically consists of 3-5 individuals, including 1 tenure-track faculty, 1-2 current students or alumni, and 1-2 additional faculty or staff (either internal or external to the department). The committee chair shares the committee's hiring recommendations with the department chair who presents the information to the dean.

B. INSTRUCTIONAL ACADEMIC STAFF

Approved UWL instructional academic staff recruitment and hiring policy and procedures are listed within UWL's HR Policies (<https://kb.uwlax.edu/104752>).

The department does not have any full-time IAS positions. Instead, the department utilizes Pool Search procedure to fill intermittent, ad hoc faculty positions.

C. NON-INSTRUCTIONAL ACADEMIC STAFF

Approved UWL NIAS recruitment and hiring policy and procedures are listed within UWL's HR Policies (<https://kb.uwlax.edu/104752>).

D. POOL SEARCH

Recruitment and hiring policies and procedures are listed within UWL's HR Policies (<https://kb.uwlax.edu/104752>).

The department utilizes Pool Searches to fill intermittent, ad hoc faculty positions. Candidates who apply to the SAA pool of instructors may not be contacted by SAA, depending on current teaching need as deemed by the Department Chair or faculty. All potential ad hoc faculty must apply to the pool and be officially hired through the HR process before they can begin teaching.

X. STUDENT RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS

A. GRADE APPEALS

Students may appeal a course grade if they deem the grade they received for a course does not reflect their performance in that course. This appeal must take place before the end of the term immediately following the term in which the grade was recorded and the student must send a letter of appeal to the Department Chair in that timeframe. Students can expect an initial response within 30 days. If additional time for review is needed the Department Chair will notify the student. Additional information and procedures for grade appeals can be found in Appendix H. Students may appeal a course grade if they deem the grade they received for a course does not reflect their performance in that course. This appeal must take place before the end of the term immediately following the term in which the grade was recorded and the student must send a letter of appeal to the Department Chair in that timeframe. Students can expect an initial response within 30 days. If additional time for review is needed the Department Chair will notify the student. Following is the university policy for grade appeals.

Enrolled students are afforded an opportunity to seek redress of perceived grievances concerning the assignment of final course grades by instructors. Grievances only will be considered for final course grades and must involve one or more of the following factors:

- An error was made in grade computation
- The grade was based on factors contrary to those stated in the course syllabus or a reasonable interpretation of it
- The grade includes a penalty for actions involving the freedom of written or spoken classroom expression
- The grade involved a breach of federal or state constitutional protections, laws, Universities of Wisconsin or UW-La Crosse policies

1. Preliminary Procedures

The student must attempt an informal resolution of the problem with the instructor no later than the 10th working day of the next regular semester (Fall/Spring). The instructor may require a written request from the student.

If the informal process with the instructor does not resolve the problem, the student should communicate, using their UWL email, with the Department Chair within five working days. The Chair may either attempt informal resolution of the problem or inform the student in writing of formal grievance policies within five working days. Communications from this point forward should use all parties' UWL email accounts.

2. Formal Procedures

a. Chair Procedures

If the Chair decides an informal resolution is inappropriate or unattainable, they should inform the student within five working days the student may

request a formal review of the matter by the Department Grade Appeals Committee. This request must be received by the Chair within five working days of the notification of the failure of the attempt at mediation. The student's petition must be in writing and include the nature of the grievance and its basis from the four factors listed in the "Policy" section above, a brief description of the attempt at informal resolution, the desired outcome the student wishes, and all supporting evidence. The Chair will, within five working days, arrange for the engagement of the committee to hear the student's appeal.

At the same time, the Chair will acknowledge the student's petition and inform the course instructor. If the instructor, upon seeing the petition, wishes to respond, this must be done within five working days.

Upon receipt of the student's petition and the potential response from the instructor, the Chair will convene the committee within five working days and deliver all written documents concerning the case, including a written account of the Chair's attempt at mediation, if applicable.

b. Grade Appeals Committee

The Department Chair will acknowledge receipt of the written appeal within 1 working day. The Department Chair will appoint the five-member ad hoc committee to hear the appeal as indicated in Bylaws Section VIII. C. 1:

- Three faculty/staff of the department (whenever possible)
- The instructor
- One faculty/staff from outside of the program

The committee will review the materials presented, including the student petition and other evidence provided by the instructor or Chair. It may ask for clarifying information from either the student or the instructor via written inquiry and may call for an oral presentation from either. Each person will be given an opportunity to respond if further evidence is presented to the committee.

Following review and consideration of the evidence, the committee will render a formal recommendation and communicate that recommendation to the Chair and the instructor within 10 days of the committee's first meeting. The report will include the committee's findings of fact, its recommendation, and its rationale for the recommendation.

Unless they are no longer a UWL instructor, the course instructor retains the right to accept or reject the recommendations of the Department Grade Appeals Committee. If the instructor is no longer a UWL instructor, the Chair

(or their designee) will assume the instructor's role. The instructor's decision at the end of this process will be considered final with no further appeal possible.

3. Further Action

Grievances related to course grades cannot be appealed except through the instructor and the department procedures described above. The assignment of final course grades involves the professional judgment of qualified instructors in a particular field of study. Administrative officers at the College or University level are assumed to not have relevant academic expertise and bear no responsibility for the determination of course grades.

If the student believes the grade appeal process, stated in the by-laws, was not appropriately followed they can pursue a grievance through the Office of Student Life. However, an appeal to the Office of Student Life cannot involve the department or instructor's decision on the grade.

4. Conditions

- At all review levels the burden of proof is the student's responsibility.
- The term "working days" refers to days when classes are scheduled.
- Grievance petitions must be individually filed.

B. ACADEMIC NON-GRADE APPEALS

Students may initiate and submit complaints regarding a faculty member. Such complaints shall be submitted in writing to the Department Chair within 90 days of the last occurrence. SAA follows the procedures for non-grade appeals as outlined in UWL's Student Handbook (<https://www.uwlax.edu/student-life/student-resources/student-handbook/>).

C. PROGRAM POLICY APPEALS

Students may appeal a program policy or decision. In this case, students should send a letter of appeal to the Department Chair within 30 days of the occurrence. Students can expect an initial response within 30 days. If additional time for review is needed the Department Chair will notify the student.

D. EXPECTATIONS, RESPONSIBILITIES, AND ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

Faculty and staff are expected to report academic misconduct per Chapter 14 of the UW System code. The Office of Student Life Office provides guidance and assistance. Academic and nonacademic misconduct policies are referenced in the student handbook (<https://www.uwlax.edu/student-life/student-resources/student-handbook/>).

Students are expected to actively engage in course content and complete all course assignments as outlined in the syllabus for the course. The department expects that students will devote sufficient time to complete all course assignments in a timely manner and to undertake additional study of the material(s) as necessary to demonstrate satisfactory mastery of the material as required by each course.

E. INCOMPLETE GRADES

As a matter of University policy, grades of “Incomplete” are issued to students strictly on the basis of illness or other unusual circumstances beyond the student’s control, which have rendered the student unable to complete a limited amount of coursework. The department adheres to the university policy on incomplete grades (<https://catalog.uwlax.edu/graduate/academicpolicies/gradesgrading/#incomplete-grade>).

Incomplete grades will be granted at the instructor’s discretion pursuant to university guidelines. It is the responsibility of students to initiate a request for an incomplete with the instructor of that course. In case an incomplete is granted, the faculty member will provide the timeline for completion of the course. That timeline will not extend more than 1 year past the original course end date.

Doctoral students with 2 incompletes cannot continue coursework until the courses have been completed.

F. PROGRAM DISMISSAL

SAA follows the policies listed in the graduate catalog relating to academic eligibility and program dismissal (<https://catalog.uwlax.edu/graduate/academicpolicies/academiceligibility/#probation-retention>).

If a student’s ineligibility is due to extenuating circumstances beyond the student’s control, an appeal to return to the M.S.Ed. or Ed.D. program may be submitted. Additional information and procedures for program dismissal appeals can be found in Appendix H.

G. ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

SAA follows the procedures outlined by the university for academic misconduct (<https://www.uwlax.edu/student-life/our-services/student-conduct/Academic-Misconduct>).

H. NON-ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

SAA follows the procedures outlined by the university for non-academic misconduct

<https://www.uwlax.edu/student-life/our-services/student-conduct/nonacademic-misconduct/>) which follow Chapters 17 and UWS 18 of the UW System code (https://docs.legis.wisconsin.gov/code/admin_code/uws).

I. ADVISING POLICY

Each student enrolled in the M.S.Ed. program will be assigned a faculty advisor. Faculty are expected to confer with their advisees at least once each semester to discuss their academic progress, career interests, and course schedule. All faculty members are expected to be accessible to students throughout the academic year and to make every effort possible to respond to all advisee messages within a reasonable timeframe.

Each student enrolled in the Ed.D. program will initially be assigned the Ed.D. Graduate Program Director as their advisor. Upon assignment of a dissertation chair, the student's advisor transitions to the dissertation chair. This typically occurs during the student's enrollment in SAA 930. This process is detailed in the Ed.D. student handbook.

XI. OTHER

A. FACULTY SABBATICALS

The Department will keep an updated list of sabbatical-eligible faculty, based on CASSH's definition of eligibility. Determination of faculty sabbaticals will follow these steps:

In April, the Department Chair will determine how many sabbaticals the Department can support in the next round. All eligible applicants will be forwarded information about applying for sabbaticals.

1. All faculty members planning on applying for sabbaticals must express their interest (in writing) to the Department Chair by May 1st.
2. If more faculty express interest than can be supported by the Department for the year of the sabbaticals, the Department Chair will facilitate a discussion at one of the May Department meetings to go over the priorities (see below) and determine if a consensus can be reached on the timing of proposal submissions.
3. The decision of who may submit a proposal will be based on the number that the Department can support and the following priorities:
 - a. First priority will be given to those who have not applied for a sabbatical (including those with first-time eligibility). If multiple people have not applied for a sabbatical, priority will be based on date of signed contract at UWL.

- b. Second priority will be based on length of time since previous sabbatical.
 - c. Third priority will be based on individual needs, including, but not limited to, such factors as formal conditions/constraints of external grants, availability of programs, timing of data collection needs, and the like.
4. Full sabbatical proposals by approved department members must be submitted to the Department Chair at least two weeks prior to the September application deadline posted by CASSH. The Department Chair will write a letter of support.

Appendix A: Statement of Teaching in the Department of Student Affairs Administration

Teaching is the primary focus for individuals in ranked and IAS positions in SAA, as well as for ad hoc faculty who are typically full-time student affairs or academic affairs professionals at UWL or elsewhere who teach SAA courses on overload or part-time appointments in any fall, spring, and/or summer term.

All SAA faculty guide graduate students who intend to become student affairs practitioners or advance their careers in higher education. Thus, SAA faculty implement good teaching practices with the goal of supporting scholarly practitioners as they acquire content knowledge, skill, and professional awareness. This includes incorporating innovative teaching techniques that are relevant to the higher education and student affairs setting, for example integration of relevant technology, making connections between theory and practice in the classroom, and implementing social justice pedagogy for all learners.

Minimal expectations for teaching activities:

All faculty are expected to set well-defined expectations, distribute syllabi (in electronic format), stay current in their field (including aligning objectives with competency standards), demonstrate competency in the applicable learning management system, return assignments and communicate with students in a timely manner, hold regular office hours or otherwise be available for regular student consultation, and implement the approved course curriculum.

Teaching in SAA

Effective Teaching:

For merit review and retention, tenure, and promotion decisions, ranked faculty are expected to demonstrate effective teaching and should provide evaluative evidence in their Digital Measures that aligns in accordance with JPC guidelines and substantiates teaching effectiveness. IAS and ad hoc faculty also must demonstrate effective teaching that will be reviewed annually by the Department Chair. Types of evidence documenting effective teaching may include, but is not limited to:

Self-assessment of teaching. This assessment may take the form of a narrative which addresses a teaching philosophy and statement of personal growth, course expectations, grading methodology, and other methods used for self-assessment. Any self-assessment should also articulate how responses to direct and indirect assessment outcomes inform teaching practices and affect student learning.

Peer evaluation of teaching. The teaching effectiveness of all faculty should be peer-reviewed semi-regularly and in consultation with Department Chair. Tenure-track

faculty, faculty undergoing post-tenure review, and IAS should also recruit faculty colleagues external to the department to review a course annually.

Student evaluation of learning: Student evaluations given in each of the courses taught will also be used as *one* measure to judge teaching effectiveness. SEI or LENS results from the Faculty Senate policy are required for retention, tenure, and promotion. SAA used additional questions as part of the SEI instrument. SAA acknowledges that SEIs are inherently biased and subjective and tend to disproportionately underrate faculty who identify as women and/or persons of color. Instructors are encouraged to use additional methods of gathering student feedback while a course unfolds.

Additional Teaching Contributions:

Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) often make additional teaching contributions outside of the classroom. SAA highly values these contributions, which can take many forms, including, but not limited to:

- Course/curriculum development/revision/innovation
- Course/curriculum grants and/or teaching materials/assessments
- Professional development related to teaching and/or licensure
- Non-credit instruction
- Student program advising

Candidates for merit, retention, tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review should provide evidence indicating the scope and impact of these types of contributions.

Further, SAA provides an instructional guide, Canvas site, Canvas policy modules, a syllabus checklist, and a sample syllabus for all instructors. Instructors are encouraged to use these resources to keep their courses current and consistent with departmental standards.

Statement on Grading:

The Teaching Assignment Information (TAI) reports used for retention, promotion, and post-tenure review for ranked faculty include grade distributions. Grading student performance in SAA involves assessing mastery. Faculty are responsible for determining if master's program students are proficient in all ten student affairs professional competencies, and for guiding doctoral students through a dissertation proposal, research, and final dissertation defense. Through this process, faculty provide substantial feedback that is used by students to continually revise and expand their work to meet competency standards (master's program) and standards of high-quality

scholarship and writing (doctoral program).

Further, grades in graduate programs tend to be higher because a C is the lowest passing grade in graduate programs. In SAA, compared to some undergraduate disciplines, grades tend to be high (typically As and Bs) because assessment is an iterative process that leads students to mastery. It is important for reviewers of faculty portfolios to appreciate mastery grading when reviewing SAA course grade distributions.

Appendix B: Statement of Scholarship in the Department of Student Affairs Administration

Faculty in SAA are expected to develop and maintain an active program of scholarship. Scholarship activity reflects the faculty's role in student affairs practitioner preparation and development, which is to provide instruction to graduate candidates in a theory-to-practice curriculum that is relevant to professional positions in a multitude of functional areas in student affairs and academic affairs administration and can support both those seeking entry to the field of higher education as well as those who are already experienced professionals seeking to increase their scholarship and career potential.

Minimal Expectations for Scholarship:

Faculty members are expected to be actively engaged in scholarship. This could involve collecting and/or analyzing data, writing manuscripts and/or grants, presenting, reviewing, and/or publishing results. Active engagement will take different forms depending on the individual and their area of scholarship.

Scholarship in SAA:

The department's definition of scholarship reflects its commitment to a practitioner preparation program that is field-based and is dedicated to developing reflective practitioners. Student affairs is an applied discipline and as such our faculty reach different audiences in different ways. However, for all of our research, the value of reaching practitioners who do student affairs practice work is of equal value to

peer-reviewed research published in academic journals. Faculty may engage in content-focused research in their specific line of inquiry, and/or they may engage in self-study or use other rigorous research methods to carefully examine their *own* instruction. Both types of scholarship ultimately result in the dissemination of findings. Grants that focus on the act of teaching and/or instructional methods are also considered scholarly products.

Faculty are expected to report their scholarly activities and accomplishments on an ongoing basis in their Digital Measures database. Contributions are generally viewed as having a higher impact when subject to peer review and directed towards a student affairs practitioner audience. Narratives describing scholarly activity should contextualize the strength and audience of the publication outlet in which faculty are publishing when they submit their materials for review.

The Department of SAA values many levels of engagement in scholarship. Benchmarks for retention, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review are articulated in the body of these bylaws. A guide to the different scholarly activities and products is given below.

Primary Areas of Scholarly Activity are those that are highly competitive and subject

to rigorous peer review by individuals or organizations external to the University. These activities include, but are not limited to:

- Publication in a peer-reviewed forum, with contextualization of the forum and its impact
- Publication of textbooks, monographs, manuals, books, or book chapters
- Editor or Co-Editor of peer-reviewed journal or book
- Keynote or invited speaker at regional, national or international conferences
- Peer-reviewed research presentation for a national or international audience
- Principal or Co-Principal Investigator for an external grant (public or private funding) that is related to student affairs

Chairing SAAL doctoral student dissertation committees

Secondary Areas of Scholarly Activity are those that are subject to less rigorous peer review by individuals or organizations external to the University or to review by peers at the University. These activities include, but are not limited to:

- Publication of a review of a book or media in a peer-reviewed journal
- Publication in a non-peer-reviewed forum, with contextualization of the forum and its impact
- Session leader at a national, regional, or local conference or webinar (e.g., scholarly paper sessions, poster sessions, leader of discussion or presentation panel)
- Peer-reviewed non-research based talk, poster, or paper presentation for a national, regional, local, or internal audience
- Principal or Co-Principal Investigator for an internal grant at the System or University-Wide level that is related to student affairs
- Supporting SAA master's student capstone projects
- Serving on dissertation committees at UWL or elsewhere

Tertiary Areas of Scholarly Activity are those that are not subject to external peer review but may receive some form of internal review. These activities include, but are not limited to:

- Reviews of books, articles, grants, dissertations, awards, or conference proposals
- Non-peer reviewed presentations at local conferences
- Serving as a Supporting Author on a grant
- Mentoring undergraduate research
- Attending conferences or symposia in support of scholarly development
- Conducting research (including collecting and analyzing data, writing manuscripts, applying for grants)
- Principal or Co-Principal Investigator for an internal grant in the College of Arts, Social Sciences, & Humanities, or at the Department/Program level, that is related to student affairs

Appendix C: Statement of Service in the Department of Student Affairs Administration

SAA faculty are expected to participate in service that aligns with and informs practitioner preparation in student affairs. SAA faculty are also expected to serve the department and their profession in a collegial fashion.

The service obligations for the SAA faculty are greater than the obligations for most faculty. Given the applied nature of the program, increased emphasis is placed on relationships with the students, assistantship and practicum providers for master's students, and to a wide variety of local, state and national organizations.

Such service activities include:

- Serving on local community organizations
- Serving on regional or national professional associations, including serving in leadership roles
- Program Directorship, either as M.S.Ed. Program Director or Ed.D. Program Director
- Serving on or chairing department committees
- Serving on or chairing CLS-level committees or university-wide committees
- Developing partnerships and collaboration with practitioners who employ SAA graduate students in graduate assistantships/internships or practica
- Participating in SAA student recruitment, outreach, and support activities
- Serving as program advisor to SAA M.S.Ed. and/or doctoral students
- Delivering service presentations to constituents of the college, the university, the community, or the profession of student affairs
- Assisting in the continuous development of program alums
- Advising student organizations

Appendix D: Policy on Outside Activities

An outside activity is an activity in which a faculty or instructional academic staff (IAS) member engages that is not part of their required university responsibilities. It is further defined in the University of Wisconsin System “Guidelines for Reporting Outside Activities” which can be found at www.uwlax.edu/hr/Forms/OutsideActivities.pdf. The department recognizes that it can be mutually beneficial for our students, faculty, and instructional academic staff alike if classroom instructors maintain and enhance their skills through clinical practice, research, consulting, publications, and other outside activities.

In February 2003, the UW-L Faculty Senate passed a resolution on outside activities that may be accessed at <http://www.uwlax.edu/hr/outside.activity/OutsideActivities.pdf>. Faculty and IAS members have a professional responsibility to be aware of potential conflicts of interest or interference with meeting their University obligations that may result from their involvement in outside activities. As a guideline for the purposes of these bylaws, outside activities that require use of more than 8 hours of University time per week may be considered excessive and likely to negatively impact on the individual’s obligations to the University and department.

If a department member feels negatively affected by the outside activities of another member, multiple routes exist to address these concerns. Such concerns may be raised with the department member involved in outside activities, the appropriate program director, or the chair of the department. Alternative choices could include the UWL Ethics Advisory Committee, the dean, or chancellor. The aggrieved department member is encouraged to pursue resolution of the concern at the lowest levels and to attempt to resolve the issue within the department; however, whistle blowing is a legitimate mechanism for resolving ethical dilemmas and can be used if there is fear of retribution.

UWS 8.025 contains the annual reporting requirement for outside activities. The process for reporting is initiated by the UWL Human Resources Department in early spring of each year. Completed forms should be turned in to the Department Chair on or before April 30th. The chair then forwards these to the appropriate Dean. The reporting form requires signatures of the Chair/Director and Dean/Designee, and may be accessed at www.uwlax.edu/hr/Forms/OutsideActivities.pdf.

Faculty and IAS who are engaged in outside activities that may produce a perceived or actual conflict of interest should familiarize themselves with the requirements of Chapter 8, in particular those sections defining conflicts of interest, the role of the Ethics Advisory Committee (8.035), actions to avoid possible conflicts of interest (8.04), and the potential sanctions for violating the policy (8.05).

All outside activities that involve teaching at another institution, while under contract at UWL, require prior approval of the Chancellor. Ultimately, the Chancellor has the final

authority to determine whether an outside activity is creating a conflict of interest.

Appendix E: Merit Assessment Rubric

Faculty Name:		Department of Student Affairs Administration		
Year Reviewed:		Faculty Merit Review – Rubric		
Merit Designation:				
		Highly Meritorious	Meritorious	Not Meritorious
<u>Section</u>		<u>Brief Explanation of Evidence (bullet points are encouraged)</u>		
TEACHING	Current syllabi for year of review	Self-Assessment of Teaching (SLO Assessment, teaching development activities, curricular innovations, teaching grants, syllabi with SLOs, teaching professional development)		
	LENS data	Peer Assessment of Teaching (observation SAA or external peer) if applicable		
	Peer Assessment	Student Evaluation of Teaching (LENS data, formal/informal feedback)		
		Teaching Grants		
		Teaching Awards		
SCHOLARSHIP		Publications & Presentations		
		Editorial Boards		

	MSEd or EdD student research guidance	
	Scholarship Awards	
	Scholarship Grants	
SERVICE	Department Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes (Indicate: Fall or Spring?) • No (Explain Below)
	College Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes (Indicate: Fall or Spring?) • No (Explain Below)
	University Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes (Indicate: Fall or Spring?) • No (Explain Below)
	Professional or Community Service	
	Service Presentations	
	Service Awards	
REASSIGNED TIME (if applicable)	Briefly address terms/expectations of assignment	
	Letter of support (if applicable)	

Appendix F: Faculty Peer Review of Teaching Form

Student Affairs Administration in Higher Education, University of Wisconsin-La Crosse

Course:

Format:

Instructor: _____

Evaluator: _____

Date: _____

Respond to each statement using the following scale:
1 = Not observed, 2 = More emphasis needed, 3 = Accomplished

Course Structure

The syllabus was complete and well designed.	1	2	3
The course learning outcomes were clearly communicated.	1	2	3
The course was well organized.	1	2	3
Course requirements were clearly communicated.	1	2	3
Rubrics for grading were provided for important assignments.	1	2	3
Course content was appropriate for the time frame.	1	2	3
The course format considered different learning styles.	1	2	3
The course included meaningful resources.	1	2	3
The course incorporates issues of diversity and inclusion into the subject matter.	1	2	3

Comments:

Instruction

The instructor displayed enthusiasm in teaching this course.	1	2	3
The instructor demonstrated command of the subject matter.	1	2	3
The instructor utilized a variety of instructional activities.	1	2	3
The instructor has the ability to communicate concepts.	1	2	3
The instructor demonstrated consistent and meaningful presence in the course.	1	2	3
The instructor was successful in communicating the subject matter.	1	2	3
The instructor motivated students' critical thinking.	1	2	3
The instructor promoted student-to-student interaction.	1	2	3
The instructor encouraged student-to-instructor interaction.	1	2	3
The instructor provided timely feedback.	1	2	3
The instructor intentionally facilitates discussions where all voices can be heard (practices inclusive excellence).	1	2	3

Comments:

General Feedback

What were the instructor's major strengths?

Improvements for future courses:

Appendix G: Ad Hoc (IAS) Evaluation Form

DocuSign Envelope ID: B954DF72-155B-4DFE-BF7A-9F3B0ABEF200



IAS (Instructional Academic Staff) Evaluation Notes

IAS Name:

Course(s) Taught:

Academic Year/Terms:

Fall

Spring

Summer

UWL Criteria	Meets Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	N/A	Comments
Evaluations – SEI/LENS comparable to department median				
Syllabi - Syllabi required except independent study.				
Learning Outcomes - outcomes in listed course syllabi				
Grade Distributions – consistent w/dept standards				
Student Comments – note any themes or trends				
Peer Evaluation/Consultation – Ideally completed every 3 yrs				
IAS Self-Reflection/Teaching Philosophy – not required				
Satisfactory Performance - duties performed satisfactorily.				

Student Evaluations
(UPLOAD SEI/LENS)

Grade Distributions
(UPLOAD TAI)

UW Mandatory Trainings
Mandated Reporter – annual
Information Security – annual
Title IX – every 3 years

UWL Forms / Resources
Forms: Telecommuting, Wings
Resources: CATL, Knowledge Base

SAA Resources in the SAA Instructor Canvas Site:

- Instructional Guide
- Syllabus template
- Syllabus checklist
- Policy Modules
- Announcements
- Links to ongoing cohort rosters w/student info

What, if any, trainings/forms need to be completed or updated?

What, if any, UWL or SAA resources (those listed above or others) have been useful?

Discussion:

What have been the most rewarding as well as the most challenging elements of teaching in SAA/L program(s)?

What have you learned about SAA/L students? SAA department? Your teaching?

What, if anything, do you need from the department, moving forward?

Overall Summary:

IAS Signature:

Date:

Dept Chair Signature:

Date:

Appendix H: Department Academic Dismissal Policy - Appeal Process

(Approved by SAA Dept. on 12.11.14; last revised 12/20/222)

Per the policy on academic eligibility for graduate students, those who earn less than a “C” in any course are dismissed from graduate study at UW-La Crosse. If a student’s ineligibility is due to extenuating circumstances beyond the student’s control, an appeal to return to the Student Affairs Administration (SAA) Master of Science in Education (M.S.Ed.) or Student Affairs Administration & Leadership (SAAL) Doctorate in Education (Ed.D.) program may be submitted. The SAA Department appeal process for program dismissals is as follows:

1. The instructor will submit the unsatisfactory grade when grades are due at the end of the semester, or Records staff will submit a failing grade if an incomplete has not been completed within one calendar year.
2. The College of Arts, Social Sciences & Humanities (CASSH) Dean’s Office will document the grade and the Academic Services Director (ASD) will send an official letter via email notifying the student of dismissal from the SAA or SAAL program and graduate study at UW-La Crosse. The Department Chair is copied on that message.
3. The Department Chair will send a follow-up email within 10 business days, confirming receipt of the Dean’s Office dismissal letter and sharing a copy of this department appeal process. The Department chair will copy the appropriate Graduate Program Director (M. S.Ed. or Ed.D.) and faculty advisor on the message.
4. After receipt of the email from the Department Chair, a student may appeal their dismissal. They should submit a letter via email to the Department Chair that addresses the following:
 - a. The extenuating circumstances that impacted their academic performance.
 - b. Evidence that these circumstances have been mitigated.
 - c. A plan for success if they are allowed to continue in the SAA or SAAL program.
 - d. Their preference to meet with the Committee in person, virtually, or not at all. (The Appeals Committee can hear a case based on written documentation alone, but the Department encourages students to present their case and be available to respond to questions during the appeal meeting).
5. While the Department bylaws indicate appeals regarding an individual course grade must be made by the end of the term following the term in which the grade was recorded, appeals regarding program dismissal can be heard within the degree completion window (seven years for M. S.Ed. students, ten years for Ed.D. students; though the “clock” begins from the date a student first enrolls, not the date on which they may be dismissed). Students are encouraged to consult the M. S.Ed. or Ed.D. Graduate Program Director to discuss the best timeline to ensure an appeal could be heard, a readmission could be processed,

and enough time would remain to complete all degree requirements within the appropriate completion window.

6. Upon receipt of an appeal letter from a student (typically within 10 business days during a fall or spring term), the Department Chair will convene the SAA Appeals Committee. Because department committees do not meet in summer terms or in January-term, appeals made by the end of the fall term or January term are generally resolved during the spring term that follows, and appeals made by the end of the spring or summer term are generally resolved in the fall term that follows.
7. The Appeals Committee will review all the information pertaining to the appeal including the appeal letter submitted by the student, the student's academic record, any pertinent notes or communications with instructor(s), and any other information pertaining to the appeal as gathered by the Department Chair.
8. When the Appeals Committee meets, they will consider all the information gathered to evaluate the appeal. Once their decision is made, and within 10 business days of the Appeals Committee meeting, the Department Chair will notify the student about that decision via email to UWL and personal emails on file, and will copy the CASSH ASD and relevant Graduate Program Director on that message. Note the following:
 - a. If the Committee approves continuation in the program, their decision may include specific conditions (such as being readmitted on probation or attempting to (re)submit work from the failed course within the semester following the F being recorded on the transcript). Students are required to confirm their understanding and acceptance of any conditions in writing following the appeal.
 - b. If the Committee denies the appeal, that decision is final. If a student believes that departmental policy was not followed, they may contact the Dean of Graduate & Extended Learning to pursue an appeal to the Graduate Council. The Graduate Council generally does not overturn departmental decisions unless the department failed to follow their own policies.

